DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 363 830 CG 026 013

AUTHOR Williams, Barbara A.; And Others
TITLE Factors That Measure Supervision Effectiveness: A Comparison of the SQ and SQ-R.
PUB DATE Mar 93
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association (39th, Atlanta, GA, March 24-27, 1993).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Clinical Psychology; *Competence; Counseling Effectiveness; *Counselor Training; Graduate Students; Higher Education; *Satisfaction; *Skill Development; *Student Attitudes; *Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Supervision Questionnaire; Supervision Questionnaire Revised

ABSTRACT

This study attempted to identify relationships between three measures of supervision effectiveness (satisfaction, supervisor competence, and supervision's contribution to skill development) and 48 supervisor behaviors as presented in the Supervision Questionnaire-Revised (SQ-R) and to compare the results with those of a previous study conducted on the Supervision Questionnaire (SQ). Subjects were 42 masters and doctoral clinical psychology students at a small southeastern university. Each received the SQ-R in his/her mailbox following completion of a 150-hour therapy practicum. Correlational analysis revealed 23 of the 48 supervisor behaviors correlated significantly ($p<.01$) with measures of satisfaction, supervisor competence, and contribution to skills. Of these 23 behaviors, 15 matched those identified in the earlier study using the SQ. Suggested by the results is that approximately 50% of the supervisor behaviors identified on the SQ-R are significantly related to supervision effectiveness as perceived by supervisees. Greater than 50% of these behaviors were consistent with those earlier identified using the SQ, suggesting a moderate degree of continuity between instruments. This continuity increases confidence in previously published results, and suggests that the revised form is measuring variables similar to the those measured by the original form. (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 363 830

Factors That Measure Supervision Effectiveness: A Comparison of the SQ and SQ-R.

Barbara A. Williams, James J. Van Nort,

and Thomas G. Titus

Spalding University

CG026013

Running Head: Supervision Effectiveness

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Williams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

This study attempted to identify relationships between three measures of supervision effectiveness (satisfaction, supervisor competence, and supervision's contribution to skill development) and 48 supervisor behaviors as presented in the Supervision Questionnaire-Revised (SQ-R; and, to compare these results with those of a previous study (Worthington and Roehlke, 1979) conducted on the Supervision Questionnaire (SQ). Subjects were forty-two (25 female and 17 male) masters and doctoral clinical psychology students at a small southeastern university. Each received the SQ-R in his/her mailbox following the completion of a 150 hour therapy practicum. Correlational analysis revealed 23 of the 48 supervisor behaviors correlate significantly ($p<.01$) with measures of satisfaction, supervisor competence, and contributions to skills. Of these 23, 15 matched those identified in the earlier study using the SQ (Worthington and Roehlke, 1979). Suggested by the results is that approximately 50% of the supervisor behaviors identified on the SQ-R are significantly related to supervision effectiveness as perceived by supervisees. Greater than 50% of these behaviors were consistent with those identified earlier using the SQ, suggesting a moderate degree of continuity between instruments. This continuity increases confidence in previously published results, and suggests that the revised form is measuring variables similar to the original form.

Factors That Measure Supervision Effectiveness: A Comparison of the SQ and SQ-R.

A major goal of training programs leading to a doctoral degree in professional psychology is the development of psychotherapy skills. These skills are presumably acquired through a series of formal learning contracts (courses, workshops, seminars) and supervised experiences (practica and internships). The formal learning is not covered in this review. This research focuses on the complex problem of supervision for students.

In general, there are three main variables to consider when studying the supervision process: The supervisor, the supervisee, and the supervision environment. The supervisor has been studied in terms of perceived personal characteristics and how these impact on supervision. Such characteristics include dimensions of the Interpersonal Influence Model (Expertness, Trustworthiness, and Attractiveness) as examined by Heppner and Handley (1982) and Cross and Brown (1983), gender of the supervisor (Worthington and Stern, 1985; Horowitz, 1990), supervisor behaviors within supervision (Worthington and Roehlke, 1979; Heppner and Roehlke, 1984), and the supervisor's experience level (Goodyear and Robyak, 1982; Worthington, 1984; and Zucker and Worthington, 1986).

Studies focusing on the second variable, the supervisee have emphasized the supervisee's perception of the degree to

which their supervisor possesses expertness, trustworthiness, and attractiveness (Heppner and Roehlke, 1984), and the needs supervisees have in the supervision process (Reising and Daniels, 1983; Stoltenberg, Pierce, and McNeill, 1987).

The third variable, supervision environment, attempts to utilize what is known about supervisor characteristics and supervisee needs to create circumstances that facilitate the supervision process. Studies have shown that supervisees will expect/need different skills training and will have different expectations of the supervisory relationship depending on the number of supervised practica a supervisee had had. For example, Heppner and Roehlke (1984) showed that while a supportive supervisory relationship was desired at all levels, more advanced students (third and fourth practica) were able to process confrontation and negative feedback more readily.

In summary, the three essential factors in studying the supervision process include the supervisor, the supervisee, and the supervision environment. The influence of personal characteristics of the supervisor and supervisee on the supervision process have been studied both separately and as interacting variables. It is this interaction between what the supervisor and supervisee brings to the supervision that creates the third variable, supervision environment. Thus, whether or not the supervision environment will facilitate

the supervision process may depend on the match between supervisor and supervisee characteristics.

The question becomes how to study each of the variables. Traditionally, supervision was conceptualized in terms of the prominent psychological theories. Thus, the first attempt at supervision involved the student supervisee in psychoanalysis as a means of acquiring therapy skills and knowledge (Worthington, 1987). Others would focus on the relationship qualities, or experiencing the supervision process in the here and now, as a means for developing the supervisee's skills and knowledge (Bernard and Goodyear, 1992).

More recently, two other approaches, less related to a specific theory in psychology, have been employed when studying the supervision process. The first of these two is a developmental approach and includes numerous models of supervision (Hogan, 1964; Littrell, Lee-Borden, and Lorenz, 1979; Stoltenberg, 1981; and Loganbill, Hardy, and Delworth, 1982). In essence, these models delineate the developmental progression of different components of the supervision process (supervisee, supervisor, supervision environment) separately, as well as in combination. The assumption is that there is a fairly consistent pattern of supervisee development as experience is gained. The same is presumed about the supervisor as well as appropriate learning environments.

The second approach might be classified as a statistical approach. Basically, this method involves analyzing ratings of a number of specific behaviors to determine: 1. More general factors that contribute to facilitating the supervision process; and, 2. How the more general factors are related to outcome measures of satisfaction, contribution to skills, and supervisor competence. Worthington and Roehlke (1979) combined these three variables giving the single measure the label of "supervision effectiveness". What this approach lacks in comprehensiveness (ie. considering only supervisor behaviors from the whole process) it gains in utility. It provides statistically derived information at two levels: general (factors) and specific (individual behaviors). The value of direct, concrete information becomes even more obvious against a background of diverse supervision models, and the fact that supervision research is still in its "adolescence" (Bernard and Goodyear, 1992). An early study using the statistical model was conducted by Worthington and Roehlke (1979) as they examined ratings on the Supervision Questionnaire (SQ). Surveying both supervisors and supervisees they found that supervisors perceived supervision as primarily providing feedback tosupervisees. In contrast, for beginning counselors, three factors were important: a pleasant supervisory relationship; structured supervision, especially initially; and, specific teaching of skills and encouragement to try these newly learned skills.

The Supervision Questionnaire (SQ) has become one of the most frequently used questionnaires in supervision research (Worthington, 1987). Its utility has already been documented. There is much to suggest its reliability and validity as well. Worthington (1984) provides a comparison of factor analytical studies of the supervision questionnaire (SQ) at two different times, as well as between the SQ and factor analytic work of Reising and Daniels (1983). In general, there is emerging consensus about what factors influence the supervision process. For example, several general factors were found related to change with experience (independence) and fostering change (support and encouragement).

As research on supervision continues, the knowledge and the instruments to measure the process change. The most frequently used instrument, the SQ, has been revised. With the rewording of several items, and the addition of eight new items much of the SQ-Revised is similar to its predecessor, the SQ. However, as with any other measurement instrument, revisions require a re-establishment of that instruments vital characteristics - reliability and validity. In an unpublished manuscript Worthington (1985) reported the six week Test-Retest reliability of the SQ-R. The results indicate a statistically significant correlation for ratings of satisfaction and impact of supervision on counseling ability. The third measure contributing to supervision effectiveness, competence of supervisor, did not

evidence a statistically significant level of reliability. This study suggests the SQ-R does possess some reliability, as well as some differences with the SQ.

The first purpose of the present study is to examine what supervisor behaviors supervisees believe to be significantly related to satisfaction with supervision, competence of supervisor, and contribution to counseling skills. In part, this study parallels one of the original works on the Supervision Questionnaire (Worthington and Roehlke, 1979). Differences are that this study uses the SQ-R rather than the SQ, and combines practica students from several levels as opposed to "beginning level" only. The second purpose of this study is to compare results from Worthington and Roehlke (1979) with results from the present study. Differences are expected given changes in the instrument, and population sampled. However, one would expect the discrepancies not to be very large as the changes are minimal.

Method

Subjects

Subjects were forty two (25 female and 17 male) masters (15) and Psy D. (27) clinical psychology students at a small Southeastern University. Subjects were selected following the completion of a supervised practicum between the fall semester of 1990 and the spring semester of 1992. Fifteen subjects just completed their first supervised practica, seven their second, nine their third, and eleven their

fourth. Return rates were (71%) 15 out of 21, (48%) 11 out of 23, and (25%) 1 out of 4 for the fall of 1990 and spring and summer of 1991, respectively. In the fall of 1991 and spring of 1992, return rates were (69%) 9 of 13, and (66%) 6 of 9. Overall, 42 out of 70 (60%) packets were returned. Subjects ranged in age from 25 to 60. Theoretical orientation was not assessed.

Materials

Containing 48 supervisor behavior items and three supervision effectiveness items, the Supervision Questionnaire - Revised (Worthington, 1984) was designed to assess supervisee perceptions of supervisor behaviors constituting effective supervision. Completed at the end of the semester, the SQ-R rates effectiveness using a 7 point Likert scale on three dimensions: 1 "Totally Unsatisfied" to 7 "Totally Satisfied"; 1 "Totally Incompetent" to 7 "Totally Competent"; and, 1 "Had almost no effect" to 7 "Had a very large effect". Forty-eight supervisor behaviors were rated on a 5 point Likert scale indicating the frequency with which each behavior was performed (1 "never descriptive" to 5 "perfectly descriptive").

Procedure

Following each semester, the names of masters and doctoral students having just completed a supervised practica were obtained from the department secretary. Each student listed as having completed a practicum received a packet of questionnaires in her/his mailbox. Of the

questionnaires mentioned, only the Supervision Questionnaire-Revised (SQ-R) was analyzed in the present study. The complete packet contained the Supervision Questionnaire-Revised (SQ-R), Bem Sex Role Inventory, Supervisee Needs Questionnaire, an informed consent letter, results request form, and instruction sheet. The instruction sheet informed subjects of the nature of the study ("Examining supervisee's perceptions of the supervision process".), time required to complete the questionnaires, and a note that supervisors and faculty were not to see the returned data. Also, detailed procedural instructions were listed: Subjects were instructed to complete each numbered questionnaire contained in the numbered manila envelope and sign their name to the back of the manila envelope. Subjects were instructed that after completing the questionnaires, they were to place them into the manila envelope, seal it, and return it to the research assistant. As each student returned the manila envelope, the numbered questionnaires were dissociated from the envelope, identifying the returnees by number only. Follow-up letters were distributed after a two week period, and follow-up phone calls were made after a four week time period. This procedure was followed for all semesters.

Results

Results of the correlations between forty eight supervisor behaviors and three measures of supervision effectiveness - Satisfaction, Supervisor Competence, and

Supervision's Contribution to Skills -are presented in table 1.

Table 1

Correlations between three measures of supervision effectiveness and the frequencies of 48 supervisor behaviors as perceived by supervisees.

Supervisor Behavior	Satisfaction with supervision	Supervisor Competence	Supervision's contribution to improved counseling
1. Established good rapport.	.5324**	.5020**	.3967*
2. Clear, jointly established goals.	.4651*	.2023	.4065*
3. More instruction in initial session vs. later one.	.2283	.2168	.2618
4. Observed your counseling at least once (live).	.0250	.0793	.0478
5. Observed three videotapes this term.	-.1198	-.3309	-.2351
6. Listened to three audiotapes.	.0482	.1888	.3097
7. Provided with relevent literature.	.2098	.3534	.2637
8. Feedback about positive behaviors.	.5153**	.5111**	.3181
8b. Feedback about non-facilitative behaviors.	.1570	.2480	.3237
9. Sensitive to differences between action and words.	-.1750	.0000	.4295*
10. Modeled good task oriented skills.	-.0172	.2182	.0251

	Satisfaction	Competence	Improvement
11. Gave appropriate direct suggestions.	.5212**	.4745	.4793*
12. Allowed co-counseling, view audio-videotapes.	.0949	.0338	.1530
13. Available at times other than scheduled.	.0558	.1601	.2962
14. Used relationship to demonstrate principles of counseling.	-.0098	.1249	.4243*
15. Joint conceptualization of clients.	.2467	.3806	.4770*
16. Encouraged experimentation.	.4815*	.3501	.4344**
17. Suggested ways to get conceptualization accepted.	.0428	.0789	.2862
18. Used humor.	.3163	.3835*	.2650
19. Used labels: Effective, ineffective vs right or wrong.	.2825	.1901	-.1854
20. Helped to develop self-confidence.	.5105**	.3968*	.3465
21. Helped realize that trying new skills is awkward.	.4563*	.3434	.4535*
22. Confronted when appropriate.	.3660	.3162	.2997
23. Helped assess self on strengths.	.5984**	.4399*	.2948
23b. Helped assess self on weaknesses	.5016**	.3495	.3889*
24. Evaluated at mid semester.	.1821	.1420	.1444

25. Re-negotiated goals at mid semester.	.1074	.0000	.1146
	Satisfaction	Competence	Improvement
26. Used name once per session.	-.0920	.0000	-.0614
27. Provide suggestions for alternative conceptualization.	.0804	.0756	.2881
28. Provide suggestions for alternative intervening.	.1035	-.0830	.3872*
29. Discusses experience in practica class.	-.0687	-.0714	.1178
30. Gave appropriate emotional support.	.4996**	.4576*	.2419
31. Taught counseling behaviors, facilitate style.	.2460	.5117**	.6710**
32. Encouraged own style.	.6049**	.6159**	.3201
33. Helped with personal problems.	.2159	.0719	.4415**
34. Role played intervention techniques.	-.0293	.3154	.4806*
35. Helped deal with defensiveness.	.0882	.1429	.5429**
36. Share own client experiences.	.2171	.2852	.2468
37. Consulted you when there was an emergency with your client.	.1667	.2043	.3002
38. Missed no more than one session.	-.0384	-.2183	.2843
39. Session lasted at least 50 minutes.	-.0500	.0936	.1521
40. Forty five minutes spent with counselor/ client.	.2290	.0637	-.0244

	Satisfaction	Competence	Improvement
41. Session focused on supervisory relationship.	.2512	.0000	.1640
42. Session focused on counseling content.	.0705	.0302	.0380
43. Session focused on dynamics of clients personality.	.0202	-.0887	.2486
44. Made easy to give process feedback.	.4524*	.5266**	.2378
45. Helped develop intake interview skills.	.0417	-.0521	.2073
46. Helped with consultation, case disposition.	.0683	.0789	.2329

n = 42

* = $p < .01$

** = $p < .001$

Twelve supervisor behaviors were statistically significantly correlated with supervision satisfaction at a level of .01 or greater. Eight of the 12 were correlated at the .001 level. A total of ten supervisor behaviors were statistically significantly correlated with perceived competence of the supervisor; five at the .01 level and five at the .001 level. Regarding perceptions of the degree to which supervision lead to improved skills, fourteen supervisor behaviors were statistically significantly correlated at the .01 level or greater. Only two reached significance at the .001 level.

Comparisons between a previous study using the SQ, and the present SQ-R study reveal a moderate level of similarities. Overall, in the previous SQ study, thirty six supervisor behaviors were statistically significantly correlated with the three measures of supervision effectiveness. Using the SQ-R, the present study reveals that fifteen of the thirty six (42%) supervisor behaviors overlapped with the prior study. Specifically, of the fourteen SQ behaviors that reached significance for the variable of satisfaction, six also reached significance as presented on the SQ-R. For the variable of supervisor competence, there were only three SQ-R items that overlapped the eleven SQ items that correlated significantly. The highest percentage of overlap between SQ and SQ-R items was on the variable of improved counseling. Of eleven items significantly correlated in the SQ study, this SQ-R study found six of the eleven (54%) to still correlate significantly.

Satisfaction with Supervision:

Supervisee rated supervisor behaviors which correlated significantly with satisfaction with supervision ($p < .01$) in both the SQ and present, SQ-R study are the following:1. Helping supervisees develop their own styles; 2. Establishing good rapport with supervisees; 3. Helping supervisees develop self-confidence; 4. Giving feedback about counseling strengths; 5. Giving feedback about

positive counseling behaviors; and, 6. Reassuring counselors that new counseling skills seem awkward initially.

Supervisor behaviors correlating with satisfaction at a significance level of $p < .01$ in the SQ-R study, but not in the SQ are: 1. Gave appropriate, direct suggestions; 2. Helped assess self on weaknesses; 3. Gave appropriate emotional support; 4. Clear, jointly established goals; 5. Encouraged experimentation; 6. Made easy to give process feedback.

Supervisor Competence:

Those supervisor behaviors that correlated significantly with supervisor competence in both the SQ and SQ-R studies include the following: 1. Used humor during supervisory sessions; 2. Helping supervisees develop their own styles; 3. Helping them develop self-confidence. Seven other supervisor behaviors reached significance in the SQ-R study, but did not match with results from the SQ study. These include: 1. Established good rapport; 2. Provide feedback about positive behaviors; 3. Encouraged own style; 4. Made easy to give process feedback; 5. Gave appropriate, direct suggestions; 6. Helped assess self on strengths; and, 7. Gave appropriate emotional support.

Improved Counseling:

Supervisor behaviors which correlated significantly with improved counseling skills in both the SQ and SQ-R include: 1. Evolving case conceptualizations jointly with supervisees; 2. Using the relationship to demonstrate

principles of counseling; 3. Being sensitive to differences between the way supervisees talk about counseling and the way they behave during counseling; 4. Reassuring supervisees that new counseling skills often seemed awkward initially; 5. Establishing good rapport with supervisees; and, 6. Helping supervisees develop their own style.

Eight other supervisor behaviors were significantly correlated with improved skills on the SQ-R results but not those of the SQ. Behaviors were: 1. Helped deal with defensiveness; 2. Worked on clear, jointly established goals; 3. Gave appropriate, direct suggestions; 4. Encouraged experimentation; 5. Helped assess self on weaknesses; 6. Provided suggestions for alternative interventions; 7. Helped with personal problems that interfere; and, 8. Role played intervention techniques.

Discussion

The purposes of the present study were to identify supervisee rated supervisor behaviors that correlate with measures of effectiveness (satisfaction, supervisor competence, and supervision's effect on improved counseling skills); and, to compare results of a previous study using the Supervision Questionnaire (SQ) with the current results of the SQ-R. The questions to be answered were: What supervisor behaviors are important to effective supervision as perceived by supervisees? , and, To what degree is the revised form of the SQ similar to the original?

In general, the answer to the first question is that many supervisor behaviors as listed on the SQ-R are of importance. Twenty six of the forty eight behaviors were significantly correlated; some were correlated with all three measures, whereas others were not. A general trend is that what seems likely intuitively was supported empirically. That is, behaviors such as established good rapport, and helped to evaluate self on strengths and weaknesses were more strongly correlated than items such as used humor, sessions length, or used ones name in the session.

How do these results compare with outcomes of previous research using the SQ? To answer this question, a comparison is made between the present SQ-R study, and one of the original studies using the SQ (Worthington and Rohlke, 1979).This latter study was chosen for comparison because it most resembles the present study, and it employs the Supervision Questionnaire prior to its revision. Thus, with some degree of confidence, it can be determined what similarities and differences might be expected between the SQ and the SQ-R given the revision of this instrument.

In general, there was a moderate degree of overlap between the SQ and the SQ-R. Of the 26 significantly correlated items in the present SQ-R study, fifteen were the same as those in the original, SQ study. Once again, the items that demonstrated stability were those that intuitively make sense (ie. established good rapport). On

the other hand, items such as "call supervisee by name one time per session" did not maintain significance after the revision. Results of this study should be interpreted within the limits of the project. One limitation is that the sample was drawn from a single university. When comparing the SQ and SQ-R, a limitation is that the prior study sampled only "beginning level" counselors, whereas the latter study combined supervisees from several levels.

Knowledge of supervisor behaviors that correlate with perceived effective supervision, and having an instrument that evidences stability despite revisions begins to place some structure into a young, complex process. As the field of supervision research continues to benefit from the testing of more comprehensive models, it is important to not lose sight of the few models and instruments that may appear more simplistic but that have a high utility index. Continued evaluation and research on such practical instruments can prove highly useful as the complex supervision process becomes more refined.

References

Bem, S. L. (1981). BEM Sex-Role Inventory. Consulting Psychologist Press: California.

Bernard, J. M., & Goodyear, R. K. (1992). Fundamentals of clinical supervision. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cross, D. G., & Brown, D. (1983). Counselor supervision as afunction of trainee experience: Analysis of specific behaviors. Counselor Education and Supervision, 22, 333-341.

Goodyear, R. K., & Robyak, J. E. (1982). Supervisors' theory and experience in supervisory focus. Psychological Reports, 51, 978.

Heppner, P. P., & Handley, P. (1982). The relationship between supervisory behaviors and perceived supervisor expertness, attractiveness, and trustworthiness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 22, 37-46.

Hogan, R. A. (1964). Issues and approaches in supervision. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 1, 139-141.

Horowitz, A. C. (1990). Supervision of Psychotherapist: The impact of gender, androgyny, and experience on supervisor emphasis. Dissertation Abstracts International, 50 (8-B), 3681.

Littrell, J. M., Lee-Borden, N., & Lorenz, J. A. (1979). A developmental framework for counseling supervision. Counselor Education and Supervision, 19, 119-136.

Loganbill, C., Hardy, E., & Delworth, U. (1982). Supervision: A conceptual model. The Counseling Psychologist, 10(1), 3-42.

Reising, G. N., & Daniels, M. H. (1983). A study of Hogan'smodel of counselor development and supervision. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 30, 129-136.

Stoltenberg, C. D. (1981). Approaching supervision from a developmental perspective: The counselor complexity model. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 28, 59-65.

Stoltenberg, C. D., Pierce, R. A., McNeill, B. W. (1987). Effects of experience on counselor trainees' needs. The Clinical Supervisor, 5, (1), 23-32.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1984). Empirical investigation of supervision of counselors as they gain experience. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, 63-75.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1985). Six week test-retest reliability of the SQ-R. Unpublished manuscript.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1987). Changes in supervision as counselors and supervisors gain experience: A review. Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18, 189-208.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. & Roehlke, H. J. (1979). Effective supervision as perceived by beginning counselors-in-training. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 26, 64-73.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. & Stern, A. (1985). The effects of supervisor and supervisee degree level and gender on the supervisory relationship. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 32, 252-262.

Zucker, P. J., & Worthington, E. L., Jr. (1986). Supervisionof interns and postdoctoral applicants for licensure inuniversity counseling centers. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 33, 87-89.